

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

Chair Rosenbaum called the adjourned regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m., **Wednesday, December 15, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Chair
Randy Neff, Vice Chair
Michael Christianson
Charles Umeda
Rene Sakala

Staff Present: Deborah Woldruff, Director, Community Development
Richard Holdaway, City Attorney
Rolland Crawford, Director/Fire Chief, Public Safety
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner
Raul Colunga, Assistant Planner
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

There were no items to be added or deleted.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. James Stocker, 26234 Mission Road, Loma Linda addressed the Commission to encourage them to drive along Mission Road to observe the houses that Ryland Homes built on the larger lots fronting Mission Road. He added that unfortunately the houses on the inside of the tract were built on much smaller lots that he considered unsuitable.

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-04-64 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NOS. 02-02 AND 02-05, ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NOS. 02-02 AND 02 05, SPECIFIC PLAN (SP) NOS. 02-08 AND 02-13 (UNIVERSITY VILLAGE AND ORCHARD PARK) - Draft Specific Plans have been prepared for the University Village and Orchard Park project sites, which are generally located between Redlands Boulevard, Mission Road, California Street, and the Edison Easement. Approximately 1,769 housing units and approximately 172,000 square feet of commercial and mixed uses are proposed for the University Village project, and approximately 1,259 housing units and 962,676 square feet of commercial and mixed uses are proposed for the Orchard Park project. Both communities would incorporate a variety of land uses and residential types. A joint program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared for both projects.

Senior Planner Lamson presented the staff report stating that on December 1, 2004 the Planning Commission continued the item to allow the applicants additional time to address issues regarding the Planning Commission's draft General Plan Land Use Plan recommendations to City Council for Special Planning Area D, and the impacts of the recommendation on both projects.

She continued to say that as requested by the Planning Commission at the December 1, 2004 meeting, a copy of the Alternative Land Use Plans of both University Village and Orchard Park had been provided for review. Additionally, Lewis Corporation, applicant for University Village, provided a map with descriptions of their Terra Vista Master Plan project in Rancho Cucamonga as an example of the type of development Lewis Corporation would like to do in Loma Linda and to obtain a better understanding of the proposed project and the developer's intentions. She added that a discussion of this Master Plan project and how it related to the University Village project would be provided with a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Lamson described staff's recommended modifications, which included the elimination of residential development on Redlands Boulevard because the last commercial opportunities

existed in that area. She continued to say that staff was recommending reducing the density for the senior housing from 27 du/acre to 20 du/ac as well as a reduction in the density for Planning Area "D". Ms. Lamson added that the applicant would go into further detail on their proposal for the frontage of Mission Road, which would include 11 lots on Mission Road with wide lots similar to what has been developed on the south side.

Ms. Lamson stated that in addition to eliminating the residential development on California Street, staff also was recommending that Alternative 2 (A2) within the Specific Plans; Alternative 2 modified the park areas, increased the park site adjacent to the proposed school and eliminated the Institutional planning area to create an additional park site. She continued to say that staff recommended that pocket parks be added within the residential. She added that a Draft Environmental Impact Report had been prepared and provided for public review, which review ended on October 22, 2004 and that responses to comments received were being reviewed by both City staff and consulting staff at RBF Consulting and would be provided for the February 16, 2005 meeting.

Ms. Lamson suggested that the Planning Commission allow Lewis Corporation to present their Terra Vista project in Rancho Cucamonga to illustrate the type of product that they would like to build in Loma Linda and then present a brief overview of the University Village project.

Commissioner Christianson commented that he believed that the Planning Commission had made a recommendation to require a maximum density of 4.5 du/ac and eliminate the Medium Density designation in area D and identify a percentage cap of 20% for high density next to the commercial area of the project. Commissioner Umeda clarified that the proposal he had made regarding the density issue was for detached residential housing for area D with a 4.5 du/ac density. Director Woldruff added that attached multi-family housing could follow normal medium or high-density requirements without exceeding the 20% cap.

Mr. Gil Prestwood, Lewis Operating Corp., 1156 N. Mountain Avenue, Upland thanked the Planning Commission for approving a continuance to the December 1, 2004 meeting. He continued to say that at that meeting, he had invited the Commission to visit Terra Vista in Rancho Cucamonga to view the applicable designs for the University Village project. He added that, for those who had not been able to go on site and for the people in the audience, he had prepared a brief presentation to show those design elements that could be incorporated in their current project.

Chair Rosenbaum invited Mr. Prestwood to make his presentation on the University Village project.

Mr. Prestwood introduced Mr. Leon Swale, Chief Operating Office for Lewis Operating Corp., Mr. Allan Fishman, Architect and Land Planner. He continued listing the guiding principals for the project as being:

- Preserve and enhance the rural atmosphere of Mission Road;
- Promote Livable/Walkable concepts based on Traditional Neighborhood Design;
- Provide a variety of solutions to the unique housing needs of Loma Linda;
- Create an orderly transition from the commercial corridor of Redlands Boulevard to the rural atmosphere of Mission Road;
- Promote Healthy Communities concepts;
- Provide advanced technology.

Mr. Prestwood gave a brief history and evolution of the project since the beginning of the Specific Plan and EIR to address the controversy regarding the traditional neighborhood design. He added that throughout the planning stages, they had tried to conform to the requirements of the evolving Mission Historic Overlay District ordinance and the ongoing General Plan Update.

Mr. Prestwood pointed out the changes to the Land Use plan as illustrated in the EIR to the Alternative Land Use plan, which included a change in the commercial land use to incorporate the entire frontage on Redlands Boulevard, a larger Heritage Park, and a density of 4.5 du/ac. He continued to list the tabulation of Land Use Summary, in acres, as follows:

Commercial	15.9
Multi-Family Attached-For Rent "HOMECOMING"	32.0
Multi-Family Attached-For Sale	19.0
Multi-Family Attached-For Sale	7.5
Multi-Family Attached-For Rent, "Senior Affordable"	9.0
Single Family Attached - 6300 S.F. Min.	20.0
Single Family Attached - 5500 S.F. Min.	15.0

Single Family Attached - 4000 S.F. Min.	8.5
Single Family Attached - 95' Min. Width	3.5
Central Park	6.6
Heritage Park	5.4
Community Park	1.4
Historic Park	2.8
School Site	11.2
Misc. Parks/Trails/ Open Space	5.3

Mr. Prestwood explained that the larger lot sizes along Mission Road corresponded to a density of 4.5 du/ac. He pointed out that Heritage Park would preserve the Zanja Trail in place and other exhibits, such as the Curtiss/Fiske House and the Cole house, and other appropriate historical resources could be added for the public's interest. He added that orange trees able to be integrated into a park space would remain throughout the development area. Other resources that would be retained are the stone carriage house and stone arch along with a monument sign to be used as a corner stone to the Mission Road corridor. He continued to say that the Historic Park would contain, at the request of the Historical Commission the Frink adobe and the orange grove.

Mr. Prestwood discussed the residences on Mission Road stating that the lots would be a minimum 95' wide with an average over 8,000 sq. ft with the Zanja Trail running behind those properties and connecting to Mission Road.

Mr. Prestwood introduced Mr. Allan Fishman, Architect and Planner for the project who would describe the single-family product.

Mr. Fishman stated that the lowest density proposed for the project in the Mission Road corridor would include 8,000 sq. ft lots and that the remainder of the single-family detached product range from 4,000 sq ft to 6,300 sq. ft adding that the higher densities being proposed near the commercial corridor at Redlands Boulevard. He added that they had committed 10% of the project for single-story homes. Mr. Prestwood interjected stating that he realized that the Planning Commission had requested that there be no medium density housing in Planning Area D. He added that it appeared on the plans for discussion purpose make for a smoother transition from the larger lots on Mission Road to the higher densities at Redlands Boulevard.

Mr. Prestwood continued his presentation to point out that the planned retail center on Redlands Boulevard was initially planned for the east side of Bryn Mawr Avenue but to address the concerns about Redlands Boulevard being the last opportunity for retail in the city. He stated that they anticipated large box development or restaurant uses and smaller shops. He added that Bryn Mawr Avenue lent itself more to small shops creating a downtown concept with some residential on the second floor, wide sidewalks that lead to the Central Park with amenities.

Mr. Fishman explained that the highest density town home product proposed was organized around a central court. He added that the buildings would be massed along Bryn Mawr and the adjacent collector streets with front doors to the street. Mr. Prestwood addressed senior affordable housing designed with amenities such as a large recreation area with a pool and various other outdoor activities, a business center type setting for seniors to get mail, etc. He discussed the density, which would be 27 du/ac stating the units would range from 700 to 800 sq. ft. He added that the site would be within 1,000 of Mission Road with connections to parks and trails.

Mr. Fishman described multi-family two-story town homes at a density of 18 du/ac with front doors through entry courts or from the street and massed to collector streets and featuring a larger community recreation areas with pool, a spa and a clubhouse and large green space.

Mr. Prestwood went on to describe the section of the project known as Homecoming having the following characteristics:

- 14,000 sq. ft clubhouse fronting on central park with a recreation area featuring a pool, a spa, built-in barbeques, gym, and a movie theater;
- A rose garden and the preserved oak grove;
- The possibility of a dog park;
- A variety of housing product;
- Community gardens, etc.

Mr. Prestwood went on to describe the trail systems were designed to take residents from Mission Road through the oak groves on the east side of the project to the retail area on Redlands Boulevard.

He continued to say that they were working with the Redlands Unified School District and the City of Loma Linda to establish a K5 school to provide classrooms for children in the project and citywide.

Mr. Prestwood concluded his presentation thanking the Planning Commission and stating that he was anxious to discuss the different aspects of the project.

Senior Planner Lamson introduced Mr. Rick Stevens of AEI-CASC, 937 S. Via Lata, Colton CA who would be making the presentation for the Orchard Park project.

Mr. Richard Kunihiro, 26433 Margarita Lane, Loma Linda introduced himself as one of several co-owners of the property who are involved with the Loma Linda University Medical Center to state that what they were looking to provide was a very high quality development, something to be proud of. He continued to say that they had invited Holland Partners to work with AEI-CASC to provide a superior project for the City of Loma Linda.

Mr. Stevens stated that their presentation would be made in two parts. The first part would address the land use and the second part would be illustrations of uses proposed for the area.

The project would feature:

- A project on 130 acres bounded by Redlands Boulevard on the north and California Street to the east and Mission Road on the south;
- The Mission School site on the north west corner of Redlands Boulevard and California Street that would be preserved and slated for adaptive reuse;
- The two commercial properties a restaurant (Cha-Cha) and a RV park (Mission RV Park) not scheduled to be changed;
- Historic homes on California (2) and Mission Road (1) to be preserved;
- Proposed Parks: one park adjacent to the proposed elementary school, an open space at the Mill Creek Zanja Trail (along the Zanja), and an open space at Mill Creek Zanja Park;
- Proposed all the commercial uses along Redlands Boulevard;
- Proposed a blend of mixed-use along California Street – Environmental Impact Report concluded that there would be no demand for 65 acres of commercial for the City of Loma Linda;
- With the realignment of Mission Road to join Orange Avenue, to continue the same character that Mission Road currently presents with large lot, i.e. 9,000 sq. ft;
- Single Family residences, 24% of the product, adjoining parks, trails and open space;
- Multi-family residential, which represented about 12% with access to Redlands Boulevard and California Street.

Mr. Tom Warren, Holland Partners, 424 Laureltree Drive, Anaheim Hills, CA addressed the Planning Commission and gave a brief history of the company and presented projects that they had been involved in. Because of their brief involvement with Orchard Park, Mr. Warren stated that they did not have a detailed project to present but would show slides of the projects that they have worked to illustrate some of the product they might plan for Orchard Park. He added that the project had been divided into 12 Planning Areas (PA) as follows:

- PA 1 & 2 – Commercial uses with examples of adaptive reuse of residential structures into commercial from other projects that they have built and that could be incorporated into the mixed-use areas along California Street;
- PA 3 to 6 – Mixed-use areas with some portions of pure commercial uses and others a mix of commercial and residential along California Street;
- PA 7 & 8 – Multi-family residences– Showed architectural styles that could be incorporated into the Orchard Park project with numerous amenities, i.e. pool, gym, community room with kitchens, etc.;
- PA 9 & 10 – Single-family dwellings – Showed architectural styles that could be incorporated into the Orchard Park project;
- PA 11 & 12 – Parks– The pictures speak to how they would integrate the park system within the specific plan central to the community and across the school site in the University Village Specific Plan.

Mr. Warren concluded his presentation and thanked the Planning Commission for the opportunity to present the project.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 8:30 p.m.

Donna Stocker, 26234 Mission Road, Loma Linda had several comments for staff and the Planning Commission:

- Ms. Stocker stated that she had heard that Mission Road would become a four-lane road – Associate Engineer Jeff Peterson replied that there were no plans to widen Mission Road at this time and that it had been planned as a 100' right-of-way with a lane in each direction and a very wide median.
- She requested that no two-story houses be built behind the existing homes to ensure privacy.
- She wanted to know who would be responsible for the street improvements such as new curbs and gutters in front of her property. – Mr. Peterson stated that he was not aware of any scheduled improvements except for the proposed driveway cuts for the existing residences because of development.

Ms. Stocker commented on the difficulty in retrieving her mail from the mailbox on the south side of Mission Road. Director Woldruff stated that the City was currently looking into the matter. Ms. Stocker asked if the current residents of Mission Road could hope to enjoy some benefits from the development such as cable television. Ms. Woldruff explained that the Loma Linda Connected Communities project was going in progress along California Street and that there would be opportunities for hook-ups for cable, high-speed Internet connections, etc. in the future. Ms. Stocker added comments regarding parking in front of the homes and the issue of a school for the children moving into the new neighborhoods.

Mr. Rick Stevens of AEI-CASC, 937 S. Via Lata, Colton, addressed the Commission and thanked Mr. Peterson for responding to Ms. Stocker's question regarding Mission Road. He commented that in most cities a 100' right-of-way could accommodate a major highway and that was why they thought Mission Road would become a four-lane road.

Richard Kunihiro, 26433 Margarita Lane, Loma Linda, addressed the Commission and commented that at the planning stage of the Orchard Park project one of the concerns was to keep Mission Road rural to preserve its integrity. He commented that they would work with staff to arrive at a design of Mission Road to connect with Orange Street to discourage its use as a shortcut to the freeway.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda, stated that she had been asked by Ms. Kathy Glendrange to distribute a letter so that it could be placed on the public record because she could not attend the Planning Commission meeting. She continued to say that the 3,028 or more houses slated for Loma Linda would surpass SCAG's projections and satisfy the housing needs of the City for the next seven years.

Mike Conley, 26397 Redlands Boulevard, Redlands, Manager of Mission RV Mobilehomes Park explained that a large number of residents at the RV park were patients at the Loma Linda University Medical Center for treatment and added that he was concerned for those patients regarding the noise and the dust that the project would generate.

Jack Hale, 26397 Redlands Boulevard, Redlands, Managing partner of Mission RV Park pointed out to the Commission that when they purchased the park in the early 1980s, the area had a high crime rate and was in disrepair with a multitude of violations issued by the State. He added that over the years it became safer and better place for the residents and he hoped that the Planning Commission would take that into consideration when they made their decision. He commented that there were many low-income residents in the park who enjoyed a good quality of life and he was concerned that they might be in danger of losing this because the project was not planned and/or designed properly. He reiterated Mr. Conley's concern regarding the dust because of respiratory problems of their residents.

Jay Gallant, 26284 Cresthaven Court, Loma Linda, stated that Mr. Jonathan Zirkle was not able to attend the meeting, explained that Mr. Zirkle had sent him a letter that he wished to have distributed to the Planning Commission but that the letter was stuck in his email and asked if the letter could be submitted at a later date. Staff replied that Mr. Zirkle could do so. Mr. Gallant continued to say that he had hoped that the north and south sides of Mission Road would have been better integrated to retain a rural feel but because of the proposed density, this integration would not be accomplished and the rural feel would be lost. Mr. Gallant also stated that he had issues with traffic that would be generated by the new residences in that project in addition to the possible development in the south hills adding to the circulation problems.

Chair Rosenbaum closed the public comment period at 8:50 p.m.

The discussion of the Planning Commission focused on the following topics:

- Preservation of the oak groves at Redlands Boulevard – Planning Commission asked that the street be designed around the trees;

- Senior residences – That they be relocated from the south end to the center of the project along with the recreation component for those residences;
- Design Homecoming central park to the center of the project;
- Plan for minimum lot width of 100 feet with mixed housing types and height and mixture of one and two-story homes;
- University Village project – Ensure that the Zanja trail be Included in the Trails system on Mission Road;
- Resolution of traffic issues at the intersection of California Street and Redlands Blvd before the projects begin;
- Design an access point to the park in Planning Area 12 from Orchard Park;
- Density – Maintain a 4.5 du/ac density for detached single family homes and reserve 20% of the project for high density multifamily;
- Planning for a school in the project – Redlands Unified School District's requirement for a school in Planning Area D. Ensure safeguards were in place regarding safety concerns associated with school crossing at Mission Road –;
- Use of density and types of construction to transition between Mission Road and development going north to Redlands Blvd;
- Integration of types of housing i.e. low, medium and high income neighborhoods;
- Formal definition of the meaning of rural, historic and urban;
- Design elements – Use of the elements to contribute to a proper density;
- Central Park – Design larger park where higher density developments;
- California Street Land Use - Plan a Mixed use designation;
- Approval of University Village - Approval to meet the Updated General Plan requirements;
- Design of lot sizes to provide the rural atmosphere;
- Addition of design as well as density standards and guidelines for the developers to preserve rural feel on Mission Road;
- Keep a good balance between development and open space;
- Discussion of clustering multi-family and town homes to obtain more open space with a workable definition of open space;
- Exterior walls – Require that building material be something other than stucco.
- Request staff to develop design guidelines - Staff replied that the developer usually prepares them.

There was a consensus on the following:

- To keep the proposed size for central park but decrease the density of the project;
- To require 9,000 to 10,000 sf lot sizes on Mission Road;
- To require lot sizes of 5,000 to 7,200 sf in the area near the park and the school;
- To require a 50-foot wide trail between the Mission Road houses and the properties to the north of the planning area to create a larger buffer to retain the rural feel of Mission Road;
- Requirement and justification for HOA dues relative to amenities available to new homeowners. How they come to the design & size of a park or other amenities to calculate the dues that the homeowners would pay?

Director Woldruff explained to the Planning Commission that although the Commission could make changes and recommendations regarding the project, the developer could still go forward the City Council with the project for their consideration.

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Umeda, and unanimously carried to continue the discussion of the General Plan Amendment (GPA) Nos. 02-02 and 02-05, Zone Change (ZC) Nos. 02-02 and 02 05, Specific Plan (SP) Nos. 02-08 and 02-13 (University Village and Orchard Park) to the Adjourned Regular Planning Commission meeting of January 12, 2005.

Commissioner Umeda suggested and recommended that a questionnaire be prepared and circulated in the community asking the residents what type of development they really wanted. Director Woldruff asked that a member of the Planning Commission be appointed to take the lead for this project. Commissioner Christianson recommended that Commissioners Umeda and Sakala be charged with preparing the questions. Director Woldruff commented that to get necessary responses to help the City make the correct decisions, the questions would have to be carefully designed. She added that Mayor Pro-Tempore Petersen and/or Ms. Georgia Hodgkin could be asked to participate in the survey.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes to approve.

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

Questions by Commission Sakala gave rise to a discussion of historical preservation.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Director Woldruff made the following announcements:

- She informed the Commission that Senior Planner Lamson had accepted a position with the Town of Apple Valley and would be leaving the City of Loma Linda and that this was her last day.
- She provided a schedule for the General Plan Update meetings with the City Council.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Rosenbaum, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 10:40 pm.

Minutes approved at the Special meeting of March 30, 2005.

Administrative Secretary

I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2004\04Dec15M-app.doc